

61-4981

Mr. Dulles:

I have been a loyal and dedicated employee of CIA for several years. I am a long way from retirement age and if present plans work out I will not be around when I reach that age. Therefore, I have no personal motive to serve in writing this but I feel strongly that I should do so.

Your new retirement policy has caused quite an upheaval and growing bitterness in the Agency; especially, of course, among the 50-60 year bracket but the condition is spreading down the age line; to irate wives at home and to friends and relatives in other government agencies. The strongest feeling generally expressed is that nowadays personnel policies as important as retirement, affecting so many people so vitally (families, mortgage holders, et al) should be submitted by management to employee committees, or representatives, for analysis and consideration in order that just compromises might be worked out; rather than a "one-sided," wholly-management made policy forced upon so many who were caught unaware and unprepared; retirement for the working person being something that must be prepared for years ahead, and as many had prepared for it on the previously existing policy. They feel that their years ahead, up to age seventy, though planned under the original retirement policy, have been seriously disrupted and that they are being unethically denied eight years of salary and annuity credit. In reducing the retirement age from seventy, the age limit most generally believed to be an equitable compromise is sixty five.

A feature in the present policy permitting those "invited" to stay on to do so, after age sixty two, is said to be extremely unjust and illogical as this is believed to be based upon personal friendships rather than age, inefficiency or infirmity. It is argued that a RIF across the board to drop surplus personnel, regardless of age, would be understood and not objectionable. I have heard stated in several quarters that a policy which permits Mr Jones to remain on his job after he reaches age sixty two because he and his boss are close friends, but forces Mr Smith to resign and retire although he is healthy and efficient, is not a policy that can be reconciled with or made compatible with good personnel relations and is sure to lead to trouble.

It is not unreasonable to predict a situation which the Agency should avoid, if avoiding it is commensurate with good management. After many irate employees who have been forced out, and their wives, have talked to Senators, officials high in the administration, relatives and friends with influence, and possibly the Federal Employees Union and news columnists, a most unsatisfactory condition with attendant publicity and serious breaches of security could result. This, because when a man's income is shut off and he is unable to meet his planned obligations, he knows no bounds.

I urge that you reexamine your present policy with a view to the possibility of reaching a compromise, or middle ground, which would serve the purpose you desire to accomplish, ease for many an unbearable load and quiet the boiling pot that otherwise is certain to explode.

I again assure you that I am not one of the "victims" and that I have written you solely in the interest of the Agency.

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY OFFICIAL ROUTING SLIP			
TO	NAME AND ADDRESS	INITIALS	DATE
1	Mr. [redacted]	/s/ LBK	20 June
2	Mr. [redacted]		
3	DD/S	[signature]	
4	D/PCT5		
5			
6			

<input type="checkbox"/>	ACTION	<input type="checkbox"/>	DIRECT REPLY	<input type="checkbox"/>	PREPARE REPLY
<input type="checkbox"/>	APPROVAL	<input type="checkbox"/>	DISPATCH	<input type="checkbox"/>	RECOMMENDATION
<input type="checkbox"/>	COMMENT	<input type="checkbox"/>	FILE	<input type="checkbox"/>	RETURN
<input type="checkbox"/>	CONCURRENCE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	INFORMATION	<input type="checkbox"/>	SIGNATURE

Remarks:

(To 1) For your information and forwarding to the DD/S for his information and whatever action is deemed appropriate.

(handwritten note) Red,
As you know, IG staff [redacted] looked into morale factor to ~~some~~ extent and was not alarmed. This is same tone as [redacted] Do exit interviews show anything. /s/ LRH

(NOTE: Original given to [redacted] after joint conversation with Mr. [redacted] and Col. [redacted] and Col. White. Col. White indicated that Mr. Echols should see. Original now forwarded to Col. [redacted])

FOLD HERE TO RETURN TO SENDER

FROM: NAME, ADDRESS AND PHONE NO.	DATE
[redacted] Asst. to the DCI	6/19/61

COPY

COPY